Previous references.
G.O. No 861-7 dt 21.8.07.
G.729-05.
G.7 127-08. Sl 24.
Later references.

1908-09
(G.7)

File No. 127-08
Serial Nos. 15, 19, 25, 33

P 31 E-K

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 15, 19, 25, 33

Part B. for February 1911.

SUBJECT.

Re, fees payable to Mr. H. Narasinga Rao, advocate.

15. From Mr. D. Sitarama Rao, Supdg Engineer, Agent to settle the affairs of the late Mr. Bakshi Basappa Urs. No. B124 dt 16-7-09.
Forwards for the orders of Govt a bill for Rs 558-9-3 from Mr. A. Channappaji Urs being the amount payable to Mr. H. Narasinga Rao, Advocate for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr. Channappaji Urs.

19. G. R. S. 58 To Mr. D. Sitarama Rao. No. 2E. 1315 dt 27.8.09
Enquire whether the amounts claimed represent the fees awarded by ~~Govt~~ Court or the amount promised at the time of [illegible]

requests him to state the amount available out of the loan & the outstanding claims and

25. From Mr. D. Sitarama Rao.
Letter No B. 166 dt 6-11-09.
forwards a bill from Mr. Narasinga Rao advocate for Rs 6098-9-3 and reports that Rs 876 is the amount now available from the loan of Rs 1,76,000 sanctioned to the late Bakshi and against it there is a liability of Rs 1710 apart from the debt to Singamma named Rs 6900.

33. 20. D. Sitarama Rao Esq.
H. No. 3352 dt 13-1-10.
States that it is not clear how Mr. Narasinga Rao's claim can be dealt with under Govt order No H 861-7/G. 29-05 dt 21.8.07 and that if he sets nothing under the arrangement indicated therein there is no way to your paying his present bill &c.

G.R.S.11] 1908. 9p.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(97)

NOTES.

File No. 127-08

FILE HEADING.

Fees payable to Advocate Mr H Narasinga Rao

From

D. Sitarama Rao Esq Supdg Engineer & Agent to settle the affairs of the late Mr Bakshi Bhimappaji Urs.

No. B 124 Dated 16.7.1907 Received 17.7.07

Diary No. 345	Enclos.	Spare Copies	Serial No. 15

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for the orders of Govt a bill for Rs 558-9-3 from ~~Advocate~~ Mr. A Chamappaji Urs being the amount payable to Mr. H Narasinga Rao Advocate for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr Chamappaji Urs.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Mr Sitarama Rao does not mention whether the claim for bill in question is admissible or not and if admissible, the source from which the cost has to be met.

1/7 Subd for orders 1) It seems that the S.D granting

NOTES—First sheet 24/7

GPB—30,000—3-1-07

Serial No.

The loan to Mr Basappaji Rao does not contemplate the discharge of the claims of the nature now preferred.

The fees due to the Advocate for defending the cases against Mr Channappaji Rao cannot, except by a stretch of words, be said to be a "debt or decree subsisting against Basappaji Rao."

2) Besides, it is doubtful if there is any balance left out of the loan amount to pay the claim in question.

wdk 3/8.

Fee Fi 32

To Branch iii for favour of opinion on point no 1 noted above.

3-8-9

Mr Varadenga Rao has rendered professional service to Mr Channappaji Rao who represented for the time being the Estate of the late Bhakshi. The remuneration for such service is undoubtedly a "debt" enforceable at law and as such is payable out of the

with reference to item no 1 please see below
14/8/09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Gl. File No. 127 of 190 8 —

Serial No.

Estate of the late Basappaji &c. Whether the Government may discharge this debt out of the loan &, I presume, for the administrative branch to decide but attention is invited to the concluding portion of para 9 of the Govt Order sanctioning the loan.

The first item in Mr Narasinga Rao's bill is not specifically referred to in Mr Sitaram Rao's letter. It may therefore be ascertained whether Mr Narasinga Rao was retained in that case on behalf of Mr Basappaji Rs's Estate.

As to the amount actually payable towards items 2 to 4, information is wanting as to whether the amounts claimed represent the fees fixed awarded by Court or whether they were the amount which was promised to be paid at the time of retaining Mr Narasinga Rao.

14/8/09 SA

To Br U

Subs. Mr 14/8. Please write for information referred to above. Thereafter

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-05

Serial No.

Mr. S. Rama may also be called to report the amount available out of the loan & the claims on it—

mrk
14.8-9

Submitted with a draft accordingly.

KS.
20/8/09.

mrk 21/8.

Issue mrk 23.8.9

for

19 To Mr. D. Sita Rama Rao

H 1315 dy 27.8.09

Enquires whether the amts claimed represent the fees awarded by Court or the amt promised at the time of retaining Mr Narasinga Rao & requests him to state the amt available out of the loan & the outstanding claims on it:

From Mr. D Sitarama Rao Esqre. Asstt Engineer & Agent on behalf of Pork & Cattle the affairs of the late Mr Bakshi Basappaji Rg.

B. 155 dy 18/8/1909.

Reminder request early orders on his letter No. 1214 dy 16.7.1909 — re the bill of Advocate Mr Narsing Rao.

On receipt of a reply from Mr. Sitarama Rao & this office letter No. H 1315 dy 27.8.09. the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—18-5-08

Serial No.

Case shall be ripe for disposal
Subd for information
N 4/9/09
mk 4/9.

25

From D. Sitaram Rao Esqr -
Letter no B. 166 dt. 6/11/1909 -
forwards a bill from Mr. Narasingarao Advocate for Rs 1098-9-0 and reports that the Rs 876- is "the amount now available" "from the loan of Rs 1,76,000 granted" to the late Bakshi and against it there is a liability of Rs 1710 apart from the debt to Singamma namely Rs 6900.

In the revised bill, it is reported that the claim under item no 1 of the bill has been omitted and new items (2,5&6) have been added -

What amount is liable to be awarded by the Court as fees has been mentioned
Subd for orders) in the second column of the bill
N 9/11/09 aggregating to Rs 832-3-0.
while the 1st column shows the amount agreed upon -

Over a thousand rupees has been charged in respect of the original suit and appeal instituted by one Srimalachar. From the list of

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

P

His name does not appear anywhere in the list of the Secured creditors of the late Bakshi Basappaji Urs. He does not appear therefore why the suits should be "hotly contested" as the decree - even if should Tirumalacha succeed in obtaining it - would be infructous, Since all the properties of the Bakshi have been mortgaged to the hilt. Moreover 1000 Rs, it is stated, have been bestowed by Mr Chappa raja wife Mrs Narasinga Rao

Mr Sitarama Rao states that there is only an amount of Rs ~~710~~ 896 remaining out of the govt loan and that against this there is Singamma's ~~unsecured~~ Secured debt of 6900, with regard to which we have already received notice of suit from her ~~Advocate~~ vakil Mr Tirumalachar Somasundaram Iyengar of Madras and another amount of Rs 1710 (particulars of which not furnished).

Besides, there are also the two clerks who have to be paid for work done in connection with the settlement of the Bakshis' debts. He is not known how many more claims

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

Serial No.

may be coming in. As the object of the govt has been achieved and there is no likelihood of any creditor taking away the properties, the best course seems to be to hand over the amo balance remaining out of the loan to mr Channappa Raja urs to meet these and future demands as best as he can.

mh 20/11.

Mr. Narasinga Rao's claim is not one of the debts of the late mr Basappaji urs for the discharge of which the loan of Rs 1,75,000 was sanctioned by govt. His services seem to have been engaged by mr Channappaji urs — mr Basappaji urs son - and it seems the matter is one for settlement bet" them. Even if it is held that this debt should also be met from the loan given by govt, it can come only under either class 3 or 4 of the classes of debts mentioned in para 9 of G.O. of 21-8-07 and mr Narasinga Rao can get only what other creditors of his class can get out of the balance of any

M

GPB—50,000—15-5-08

Serial No.

which remains after Satisfying the claims of creditors of the first two classes. Vide para 9 of the Same G.O.

The balance remaining out of the loan of Rs 176000 is stated to be insufficient for meeting even the unsettled - claim of a Secured creditor - Suiganma - and in Such Circs no portion of the balance Can be diverted for meeting Mr Narasingarao's claim. It is out of the question to give a further loan for meeting claims of this kind & if Mr N Rao Can not get anything under the method of Settlement of Mr Basappaji Rao's debts mentioned in para 9 of the G.O. of 21-8-07, Govt have no Concern with his claim which he may enforce in ways open to him. In reply to this reference on this Subject Mr Seetharamarao may perhaps be informed that Mr Narasingarao's claim Can only be dealt with under para 9 of the order & if he gets nothing under the arrangement indicated therein, Govt do not See their way to help him in getting his dues.

A

To Branch III for favour of opinion

1/

Jan 15.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

if the proposed reply is legally unobjectionable

mmh
24.11.09

Subd for orders.

SN
26-11-09

the reply as proposed in the Concluding para (marked A) of the above note is legally unobjectionable

2/12/09.

Draft Subd
N 13/12
14/12

mmh
14-12-09

3553
15.12.09

Dewan

N
14/12/09

14.12.09

Landon That the Bill was removed without keeping a copy of it on the file - It is now impossible to ascertain the areas of the 590 Plots dealt with in the Bill - I would like to know whether the Bill can be obtained from Messrs -

Bill passed as proposed

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 127 of 1908

Serial No.	
33	To D Sitarama Rao Esq H nº 3352 dt 13-1-1910. States that it is not clear how mr Narsingh Advocate's claim can be dealt with under sort order nº H 861-7 dt 21/8/190-, and that if he gets nothing under dt 29-9-09 the arrangement indicated therein there is no bar to your paying his present bill etc.
	DO. nº 740. To. mr Sitarama Rao. Invites reference to H nº 3352 dt 13/1/1910 Observes :- it is for him to reduce the lawyers fees as far as possible to the Statutory Scale and to discourage extravagant demands.
	D.O fr. nº 775 dt 31-3-1910 - from mr Sitarama Rao: Furnishes facts in regard to the fees claimed by mr H Narsingrao and States that as he had no powers to pay the bill he had to forward it for the orders of sort and that he feels not justified to approach mr H Narsing Rao for the reduction of the bill.
	DO. nº 812 dt 21-4-1910. To. mr Sitarama Rao Instructing him to deal with the matter regarding the payment of fees due to mr H Narsingrao out of the funds that may be available with him
	Submitted for orders. May the file be now recorded N-36 23/2/11

NOTE—Contra sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

23/2/11

Cls 7 NO 127-08

558-9-3

550-9-3.

34 oz 07-8

No 34 Metallic Varnish
(Item 2) by
Terminal Lacker Factory

No 703 Metallic Lacquer
(Item 4) for scent value
130 odd

Price 50% marked
Item Items 2 & 4 added

No	Metallic 34 Varnish PT	500	352-5-
	A5234 do	500	352-5-
	310 do	889-3	88-9-3
	703 Metallic Lacquer	20 —	7-8 —
	A1 42 Nail Polish	20 —	7-8
		20 —	20 —
		1148-9-3	832-3-3

1148-9-3
555-9-3
59 0-

1148 A 3/1

pd 50
1098-9-3

Draft as per orders.

Bangalore 12

O. No. 740 28th March 10

Dear Mr. Sitaramarao

I am desired to invite your attention to the correspondence ending with the final Secy's offl. letter to you, No. H 3352 — G7 127-08-33 dated the 13th January 1910, on the subject of the fees payable to Advocate Mr. H. Narasingarao for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr A. Chamappaji Urs, son of the late Mr. Basappaji Urs.

Draft as per order.

Bangalore 12

O. No. 740 D 28th March 10

Dear Mr. Sitaramakao

I am desired to invite your attention to the correspondence ending with the Finl: Secy's offl: letter to you, No. 71 3352 — G7 127-08-33 dated the 13th January 1910, on the subject of the fees payable to Advocate Mr. H. Narasingakao for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr. A. Chamappaji Urs, son of the late Mr. Basappaji Urs.

2. Bakshi Chamaffa-
-ji Hrs has been seeing
the Dewan and speaking
to him about the ~~case~~ matter
and representing that
unless the lawyer's fees
are paid the conduct
of the cases will be
considerably hampered
and business may
suffer. The Dewan
wishes to point out
to you that it is a
matter of negociation
and that it is for you
to reduce the lawyer's
fees as far as possible
to the statutory scale
and to discourage
extravagant demands.

The

Office,

31st March 1910.

My Dear Mr. Matthan

With reference to your D.O., dated 28th March regarding the fees payable to advocate Mr. H. Narasinga Rao for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr. A. Chamappajee Urs I request you to place the following facts before the Dewan Sahib.

(1) The suits in which Mr. H. Narasinga Rao --- appeared on behalf of Mr. A. Chamappajee Urs were not in connection with the debts I was desired to settle.

(2) Mr. H. Narasinga Rao was engaged by Mr. A. Chamappajee Urs and Mr. H. Chicke Urs his father-in-law who is interested in the affairs of Mr. A. Chamappajee Urs.

(3) Mr. A. Champpajee Urs presented the bill of Mr. H. Narasinga Rao to me for conducting his two suits and asked me to pay the same. As I had

no

15

no powers to pay the bill since it did not lie in the list of debts to be settled by me, I had to forward the same for the orders of Government.

Under these circumstances and the present altered conditions I feel I will not be justified in approaching Mr. H. Narasinga Rao to reduce his bill.

Mr. H. Narasinga Rao is furnished with a copy of Finiancial Secretary's Official letter dated 13th January 1910 to me, for his further action.

Yours Sincerely,

D. Samuadhan

EW

In these circs the proper course for us is to have some one sent to examine the bills & the Chiefs - but as he accepted them & forwarded them to Govt it is rather awkward

Submitted with Dy. T. No 740 of 28 Mar 10 & 97 127-08.

C&R
1 Apl 10

16 D.O. No. 812

Camp Bijapur
21/4/10

Rajadhon

Dear Mr Sitarama Rao,

In acknowledging the receipt of your D.O. letter of the 31st March 1910 on the subject of payment of the bill of the Advocate Mr H. Narasimhacharya for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr H. Channappa Hajiberi, I am directed to observe that in the circumstances explained in your letter the proper course for you to pursue would have been to return the bill to Mr Channappa Hajiberi. But as you have accepted them and forwarded them to Sir the Diwan considers it rather awkward now (at this distance of time) to refuse payment and he will therefore be obliged by your dealing with the matter so that payment may be made out of the funds now in hand

Yours Sincerely
[illegible]
A.S.

Copy with letter

17

D.O.No. 812

Camp Mysore,

21st April 1910.

Dear Mr. Sitarama Rao,

In acknowledging the receipt of your D.O. letter of the 31st March 1910 on the subject of payment of the bill of Advocate Mr. H. Narasinga Rao for having conducted the defence in two suits on behalf of Mr. A. Chamappaji Urs, I am directed to observe that in the circumstances explained in your letter, the proper course for you to pursue was to return the bill to Mr. Chamappaji Urs. But as you have accepted them and forwarded them to Government, the Dewan considers it rather awkward now (at this distance of time) to refuse payment, and he will therefore be obliged by your dealing with the matter so that payment may be made out of the funds now in hand.

Yours sincerely,

s/f K. Matthan

Under Secretary on duty with the Dewan.

Copy submitted to Secretary / Genl & Rev Depts. with file No 127/08.

22.4.10.

Secretary / Genl & Rev Depts

II
Pt 08/1609

345 V

(1) 190 127 08-15

From D. Sita Ramarao Esquire, supdg. Engineer, & C. and agent of Govt. to settle the affairs of late Bakshi Nur. Basappaji Urs.

To H S Chandrasekhara Iyer Esqr. Secretary to the Govt of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore Gen and. Rev Department Bangalore.

Dated 15. 7. 08

Despatched 16. 7. 08.

Received

General No. B. 124
No.

Enclosure No. one bill.

Sir,

I have the honor to forwards herewith for favor of your obtaining the orders of Government thereon a bill for Rs. 558-9-3 received from Nur. A. Shamappaji Urs as being the net amount of fees payable to advocate Nur. A. Narasingarao for conducting the defence on behalf of the said Nur. Shamappaji Urs in the suits filed against him as mentioned therein —

2. Suit No. 34 of 1907-08, on the file of the Subordinate Judge's Court, Mysore (Item No. 2 in the bill) was by one Thirumalachar for the

2

the recovery of Rs. 9,000-0-0 stated to be due to him under two promotes alleged to have been executed by the late Mr Basappaji Urs in his favor. This suit was dismissed; but it is learnt that Thirumalabhar has appealed against the decision of the Sub-Court.

3. Suit No. 703 of 1907-08 in the Court of the Principal Munsiff of Mysore (Item No. 4 in the bill) was also for the recovery of Rs. 130 and odd alleged to have been due to the plaintiff from the late Mr. Basappaji Urs on account of certain Indian Scents purchased. The decision in this case also is stated to have gone against the plaintiff.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

P. Ramachandra Rao

agent on behalf of Govt.
to settle the affairs of late Bakshi
Mr. Basappaji Urs.

3

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 127-9

Serial No. 19

Diary No. of letter replied to 345

No. H 1315.

27-8-09

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Gl. Sec:)
, the 190

To

D. Sitharama Rao Esq:
Superintending Engr,
and agent of Govt: to settle the
affairs of the late Mr Balaji
Basabhaji Deo.

Date of issue 27 August 09

Signed by [illegible]

Sir,

In returning herewith the
bill received with your letter No:
B 124 dated 15-7-09, I am directed
to enquire with reference to the first
item in the bill whether Mr Narasinga
Rao was retained in that case on behalf
of Mr Basabhaji Deo's Estate. As regards
items 2 to 4, I am directed to
enquire whether the amounts claimed
represent the fees awarded by the
Court ~~of Law~~ or the amount promised
&c.

SUBJECT.

4

to be paid at the time of retaining

Mr. Narasinga Rao.

I am also to request you to be so good as to take the amount available out of the loan & the outstanding claims on it.

I have to:

23.8.9

In fin: Sch. pt:

KS 20/8/09

2118.

2618

List of enclosures.

Copied by 25/8

Examined by

MGCPB—30,000—16-2-05

No B 166

5 1862

8 + 12 7 08

(5)

Office of the Agent of Government
to settle the affairs of the late
Mr. Basappaji Urs.

Dated, ~~Mysore~~ Bangalore 6th November 190

From

D. Sitarama Rau, Esquire,
Agent of Government to settle the affairs of
the late Mr. Basappaji Urs.

To

J. S. Chakravarthy Esquire, M. A., F. R. A. S.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

With reference to yur letter No. Fl 1315 / Gl.F.12-7-08 dated the 27th August last regarding the claim of Advocate Mr. M. Nara singa Rao on account of his acting and conducting the defence on behalf of Mr. A. Chamappaji Urs, son of the late Mr.Basappa-ji Urs in certain suits filed against the latter, I have the honour to submit herewith for the orders of Government, letter dated 22-10-09 from the said Mr. Narasinga Rao and its enclosure, together with copy of my letter No.R 152 dated the 20th idem to which it is a reply.

2. In his revised bill Mr. Narasinga Rao omits as having been adjusted, the first item of his original bill, viz., "Rs.50 on account of fees for obtaining the required certificate for collecting the dues from the Steam Navigation Company owing to the late Pakshi", and adds 3 new items, viz., those numbered 2, 5 and 6, thus raising his net claim from Rs.558-9-3 to Rs.1098-9-3.

3. The amount now available from the total loan of Rs.1,76, 000 sanctioned is Rs.876, and the liabilities existing there against, apart from the claim of Rs.6900 of Singamma amount to Rs.1710. I beg to invite in this connec-

6

connection, the reference of Government to paras 4,5 and 6 of my letter No.B 158 of the 22nd October 1909.

W
in linked
Tel (it is not
will be
at this time of
receiving
Sec.)

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

A g e n t .

22 : 10 : 09

From 4.7121-08 Kingston (1)

H. Kandasamy, Esqr.
Kingston

To

D. Sathiyamoorthy Esqr
Superintendent Engineer
W.C

Extract of Government to
Agent of Govt to settle his
affairs of Late Mr Basnayake

Sir.

With reference to your Com-
-munication dated 20th inst to 3.152
In this
I have the honor to State that I have
herewith forwarded a Survey bill giving
the details of the information required
in execution of the decree of the Sub Judge
I have also got an attachment effected
of a property in favour of the Judgment
-debtor on which a suit is pending
in the Commercial Court of Kingston - As the
Case is still pending in appeal in the

Chief Court I am not in a position to
recover the Costs to pay the Same being
very poor. Besides I am not certain
of the Solvency of the Just-debtors & I am
very fond it difficult to recover any
thing ultimately. As the Cases in question
are both Contested I have charged
more than the fees allowed to me by
Court & hope you will kindly recommend the charge of the amount claimed

I have the honour to
remain
Sir
Your most Obedient Servt

H. Narasinga Rao

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಹೆಸರು	ಕ್ರಯ ರೂ.	ಕ್ರಯ ಪೈ.	ಕ್ರಯ ಪಾಯಿ	ಸಂಗ್ರಹ ರೂ.	ಸಂಗ್ರಹ ಪೈ.	ಸಂಗ್ರಹ ಪಾಯಿ
1		500	.	.	354	5	.
2		500	.	.	354	5	.
3		88	9	3	88	9	3
4		20	.	.	7	8	.
5		20	.	.	7	8	.
6		20	.	.	20	.	.
		1148	9	3	832	3	3
		50					
		1098	9	3	.	.	.

22-10-09

No. 15-2
En. 16th.

Camp Mysore 10
Cl. 712-08 / dated 20th October 08
Y 25

From.

D. Sitaramaiah Esqr.
Superintending Engineer and
Agent for settle the affairs
of the late Mr. Basappaji Urs.

To.

A. Narasinga Rao Esqre.
Advocate, Chamarajpet,
Mysore.

Sir,

I forwarding herewith an extract from letter No Cl. 1315 / Cl. Fi. 127-08 dated the 27th August 08 from the Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore with your bill for Rs 558-9-3 thereon referred to, I have the honor to state as below:-

(i) It is learnt that the first item in the bill relates to a matter connected with Mr. Chamappaji Urs' household personal affairs and not with his Estate. The cost may therefore be struck off, deeming it to have been paid out of the amount of Rs 600 that has already been received and accepted by you.

(ii)

4)

(ii) As regards Items Nos 2 to 4, it is understood that the suits were decided in favor of your client Mr. Chamappaji Rao and decrees passed for recovery of the Costs incurred in defending the same from the plaintiffs in the respective cases. It is necessary to know what fees were actually awarded by the Court in these cases, and if process has already been taken against the judgment-plaintiffs for the execution of these decrees whether you cannot get your claims adjusted from the amounts realisable from them.

2. To enable the disposal of the above reference from Government, I request you to favor me with a reply to this Communication and forward a revised bill, if necessary, as suggested in sub para (i) supra.

I have the honorable
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Sd/ D. Sitaramaiah
Agent to Government

"Copy"

D. Sitaramaiah
Agent to Govt. to the Hon'ble the
Affairs of the Jaghir Estates

12

G.R.S. 26]

File No./17-08
Serial No. 33

Diary No. of letter replied to 1862

No H 3352
dt 13-1-1910

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190

To

D Sitarama Rao Esq
Agent of Jath to settle the
affairs of the late Mr.
Babaji Banaffaji Ch

Date of issue 13-1-1910

Signed by [illegible]

Sir,

Adverting to the Correspondence
ending with your letter No
B. 166 dt 6th November 1909 -
re the fees payable to Advocate
Mr H Narasing Rao, I am
directed to state that ~~the~~
Narasing Rao's claim can
~~only~~ be dealt with under
~~previous~~ Govt No. 7L 861-7
dt 21/8/07
G 729-05

over.

Not under despatch

It is N.P. Clear
~~*Paid*~~ *how Mr.*

SUBJECT.

Appr 11/1

and that if he gets nothing
under the arrangement
indicated therein, there is apparently
no way ~~for him to~~ ~~do not see their way to help him~~ of his paying his present bill
in getting his due.

I have etc.

H Secretary

2 The bill also
is exorbitant
in charging about
£16 over & above
the regular fees
which may be
reasonable for
the Court - And the
Office viz £5 20 by
what the said
bill exceeds
the just
& legitimate
as the said bill has not
been framed by you.

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—10,000—20-4-06.